

**Remarks**

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed April 4, 2005 and is being entered in the record for the above captioned matter.

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1-19 have been rejected. Claims 3, 4, and 8 have herein been amended.

**In the Drawing:**

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failure to show every feature of the claim, specifically, failure to show the structure enabling the reservoir to be removable as recited in claims 3, 4, and 8.

Page 18, line 16-18 of the Specification states that, "The agent mixing chamber 324 or 324a is preferably removable and replaceable from the dechlorination device, and may be removed without removing the dechlorination device from the fluid flow path." Claims 3, 4, and 8 have been amended to comply this paragraph of the specification, that is, the agent mixing chamber is removable and replaceable.

In compliance with 37CFR 1.121(d) drawing sheets have been corrected to show the structure enabling the agent mixing chamber to be removable as recited in amended claims 3, 4, and 8. Therefore, Replacement Sheets containing Figures 1 and 4 are enclosed showing the structure, particularly the access cap, enabling the agent mixing chamber to be removable as recited in claims 3, 4, and 8. As such, the Examiner's objection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

**In the Specification:**

Page 18, line 16-18 of the Specification states that, "The agent mixing chamber 324 or 324a is preferably removable and replaceable from the dechlorination device, and may be removed

without removing the dechlorination device from the fluid flow path.” The agent mixing chamber is removable and replaceable through an access cap. As the access cap is indicated to in the specification portion stated above and claims 3, 4, and 8, it does not constitute new matter.

**In the Claims:**

Claims 3, 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enabling requirement. For the above stated reasons in conjunction with the amendment to Claims 3, 4, and 8, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner's rejection concerning Claims 3, 4, and 8 has been traversed and the Claims are now in a condition for immediate allowance.

Claims 1-11 and 17 were rejected by the Examiner pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wiedrich et al. For the following reasons, the Applicant respectfully asserts that this 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection has been traversed by this preliminary amendment and by argument herein.

With respect to Claim 1, the Examiner has asserted that Wiedrich et al discloses a similar method for dechlorinating a fluid. The applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the step of: “connecting a by-pass integrated dechlorination device to a fluid flow source;” As described herein, Wiedrich et al does not disclose a by-pass integrated device in its totality. Hence, Wiedrich et al does not contain this limitation. Therefore the Applicant respectfully asserts that this 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection has been traversed.

As to dependent Claim 2, it is dependent on independent Claim 1. Therefore, if the above transverses the examiner's rejection, regarding Claim 1, then dependent Claim 2 would also be in a condition of allowance.

Regarding dependent Claim 3, it also is dependent on independent Claim 1. Therefore, if the above transverses the examiner's rejection, regarding Claim 1, then dependent Claim 3 would also be in a condition of allowance.

As to dependent Claim 4, it is dependent on dependent Claim 3, which is dependent upon independent Claim 1. Therefore, if the above transverses the examiner's rejection, regarding Claim 1, and subsequently dependent Claim 3, then dependent Claim 4 would also be in a condition of allowance.

Regarding Claim 5, the Examiner has asserted that Wiedrich et al discloses a device for dechlorinating fluid. The Wiedrich et al device is a chemical feeder wherein the chemical feeder can accept full flow through the Wiedrich device or partial flow if the Wiedrich device is piped as part of a bypass to accept proportional flow of the fluid.

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claim 5, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al. The present invention comprises a flow tube as part of the invention, which Wiedrich does not. This is an important feature of the present invention that provides the present invention with its portable and efficient nature, that is, it can be directly connected to a system with ease.

The reservoir in the present invention is part of a complete system for delivering a dechlorination agent. The complete system contains a flow tube that easily connected to a source of water, a bypass system for a determined amount fluid flow to be directed through a dechlorination agent reservoir, and a dechlorination reservoir. The totality of these components, the synergy of the combination of the components and the efficiency of the connection to the source of the fluid flow provide the present invention its uniqueness.

The Wiedrich et al device does not disclose the ease of connection to a source of fluid flow,

not does it disclose the synergistic effect of the combination of the components with the added unique benefit of the ease of connection to a fluid flow source. Even if the Wiedrich et al device were piped in a way similar to the present invention, it would still be lacking the ease of connection that the present invention is designed for to make it portable and efficient. That is, the present invention can be readily carried to a remote site, quickly hooked into a piping or hose system, ready for use. The Wiedrich et al device does not contain these limitations.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 6, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5. It is the totality of the components, the synergistic effect of the combination of the components, and the efficiency of the connection to the source of the fluid flow provide uniqueness to the present invention. Piping in a control valve in conjunction with the Wiedrich et al device along with the disclosure in the Wiedrich et al device does not conjure the uniqueness of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 7, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5. Again, it is the totality of the components, the synergistic effect of the combination of the components, and the efficiency of the connection to the source of the fluid flow provide uniqueness to the present invention. The inclusion of an agent mixing chamber as part of the dechlorination agent reservoir does not conjure the uniqueness of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 8, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5 and dependent Claim 7.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 9, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5 and dependent Claim 7.

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 10 is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5 and dependent Claim 6.

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claim 11, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5.

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claim 17, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al for the same reasons as stated above regarding independent Claim 5 and dependent Claim 11.

Claims 12, 13 and 19 were rejected by the Examiner pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiedrich et al in view of Heany. For the following reasons, the Applicant respectfully asserts that this rejection has been traversed by this preliminary amendment and by argument herein.

With respect to claims 12 and 13, the examiner has asserted Claims 12 and 13 are unpatentable over Wiedrich et al in view of Heany; in particular, with regard to the configuration of the inlet and outlet tubes. There is no indication that the inlet tube is configured to divert a proportional flow from the main flow. It appears the configuration is merely to capture gravity fed flow. Hence, Heany would only operate in its drawn configuration, that is only when gravity can assist with flow.

As for the outlet tube, Heany indicates that the outlet tube creates a siphon effect. This siphon effect is created by the gravity flow of fluid through the main flow, in addition to the effects of gravity through the outlet tube itself.

In the present invention, flow can occur in many, and any configuration; that is, diversion of flow is not motivated by gravity. Additionally, flow through the dechlorination device in the present invention is most nearly provided by a force, a pump. The force of the pump, either alone, or with

the assistance of a control valve, determines how much fluid is diverted. The same cannot be said of the Heany device.

Lastly, although both Wiedrich and Heany contain a system of piping, there is no suggestion that one could or should be combined with the other. Wiedrich discusses a chemical feeder in a chemical application, while Heany discusses a disinfecting apparatus in a septic application.

With respect to Claim 19, applicant relies on the discussion contained herein regarding Claim 5 and Claims 12 and 13.

Applicant respectfully states that the cited prior art, alone or in combination, does not anticipate or make obvious applicant's claimed invention.

Claims 14, 15, 16, and 18 were rejected by the Examiner pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiedrich et al in view of King. For the following reasons, the Applicant respectfully asserts that this rejection has been traversed by this preliminary amendment and by argument herein.

With respect to Claim 14, applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 14, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al in view of King. Although King does discuss flow through a device based on the direction of an opening relative to the direction of the main flow, it does not incorporate the unique features of the present inventions, that is, the particular shape of inlet diverter and outlet converter as shown in Fig. 1. It is this combination, along with the force of a pump and angular configuration of the inlet and outlet tubes that makes the present invention's diversion design superior without the aid of a pressure drop device in the main flow path located between the inlet and outlet tubes.

Lastly, although both Wiedrich and King contain a system of piping, there is no suggestion

that one could or should be combined with the other. Wiedrich discusses a chemical feeder in a chemical application, while Heany discusses an apparatus for dissolving a solid in a liquid.

Applicant respectfully states that the cited prior art, alone or in combination, does not anticipate or make obvious applicant's claimed invention.

As to Claim 15 and Claim 16, applicant relies on the discussion contained herein regarding Claim 14.

Again, although both Wiedrich and King contain a system of piping, there is no suggestion that one could or should be combined with the other. Wiedrich discusses a chemical feeder in a chemical application, while Heany discusses an apparatus for dissolving a solid in a liquid.

Applicant respectfully states that the cited prior art, alone or in combination, does not anticipate or make obvious applicant's claimed invention.

As to Claim 18, applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claim 18, is not disclosed by Wiedrich et al in view of King. Although King does discuss use of a flexible tube, and as the examiner indicated, the purpose of the flexible soft material is to facilitate a connection. In the present invention, as stated on page 12, lines 10-12, the use for flexible tubing in the present invention is to aid in the efficient movement of fluid flow, which can be diminished by severe changes in flow direction caused in hard piping connections, and to assist in positioning the dechlorination device.

Since these design considerations between the present invention and the cited inventions are inconsistent, the applicant respectfully states that the cited prior art, alone or in combination, does not anticipate or make obvious applicant's claimed invention.